

**REMARKS**

**Summary**

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, 19 and 23 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are requested.

**Specification Objection**

Page 2 line 12 of the specification stands objected to because of the informalities detailed on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant has made the suggested changes and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the specification objection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,449,260 to Sassin et al. (hereinafter “Sassin”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23 recite “receiving a first request for caller information at a web server during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller; retrieving call information associated with said call session at said web server; retrieving said caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller; retrieving call context

information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call; generating a dynamic web page at said web server from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web server by a selection module; and sending said web page in response to said first request.”

Applicant submits that Sassin fails to teach or suggest at least the above-identified language of independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. Although Sassin mentions a call session initiated in response to a web based inquiry, Sassin does not teach or fairly suggest receiving a first request for caller information at a web server during a call session *initiated in response to a telephone call* from a caller as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Sassin fails to teach or suggest all the features recited by independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. As such, Sassin is insufficient to anticipate independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23 under § 102. Applicant submits that such claims are allowable for at least this reason. Applicant further submits that claims 2-15, 17, 18, 20-22, and 24-26 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims, as well as on its own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-26.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States No. 7,149,287 to Burger et al. (hereinafter “Burger”) in view of United

Appl. No. 10/632,286  
Response Dated December 4, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of September 4, 2008

Docket No.: P16477/1020.P16477  
Examiner: Xavier S. Wong  
TC/A.U. 2616

States Patent Publication No. 2004/0047453 to Fraser (hereinafter “Fraser”) and further in view of United States Published Patent Application 2003/0069937 to Khouri et al. (“Khouri”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As correctly noted in the Office Action, Burger and Fraser fail to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. For example, neither Burger nor Fraser teaches or suggests generating a dynamic web page at said web server from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web server by a selection module as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23.

When addressing the independent claims, the Office Action relies on portions of Khouri related to establishing a connection between an agent and a user viewing a webpage. Applicant submits, however, that the teachings of Khouri clearly do not remedy the admitted deficiencies of Burger and Fraser with respect to independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. For example, while Khouri arguably discloses a CTI serving select web pages, there is no teaching or suggestion in Khouri of selecting said plurality of web page templates at a web server using caller information and call context information. Therefore, the web page selection described in Khouri, and relied upon in the Office Action, does not disclose the claimed limitations of generating a dynamic web page at said web server from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web server by a selection module, as recited by independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23.

Appl. No. 10/632,286  
Response Dated December 4, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of September 4, 2008

Docket No.: P16477/1020.P16477  
Examiner: Xavier S. Wong  
TC/A.U. 2616

Therefore, even if Burger, Fraser, and Khouri could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. Consequently, Applicant submits that Burger, Fraser, and Khouri are insufficient to render obvious independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23, regardless of whether such references are taken alone or in combination with another. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23 are allowable and that dependent claims 2-15, 17, 18, 20-22, and 24-26 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-26.

Appl. No. 10/632,286  
Response Dated December 4, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of September 4, 2008

Docket No.: P16477/1020.P16477  
Examiner: Xavier S. Wong  
TC/A.U. 2616

**Conclusion**

It is believed that claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to deposit account 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/  
John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: December 4, 2008  
KACVINSKY LLC  
C/O Intelleivate  
P.O. Box 52050  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(724) 933-5529